

REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, Applicant gratefully acknowledges the allowance of subject matter in claims 4-7 and 11-14 if rewritten in independent form. Claims 15-28 are withdrawn from further consideration as being drawn to non-elected species and groups. Applicant appreciates the withdrawal of the election requirement drawn to species a [claims 1-7] and acknowledges the examination of claims 1-14.

Claims 1-3 and 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hasegawa in view of Akram. Applicant traverses the rejection because Hasegawa in view of Akram fail to teach or suggest, a substrate mounted on a stem, and a laser diode mounted on the substrate, as in independent claims 1 and 8.

The Examiner states that the stem disclosed by Hasegawa “works as a substrate for mounting components,” but claims 1 and 8 recite a different structure. Hasegawa discloses an optical pickup having a laser diode 8 on a stem 6. In contrast, claims 1 and 8 recite a substrate mounted on a stem and a laser diode mounted on the substrate. By mounting a substrate on a stem and a laser diode on the substrate, the substrate can be insulated from the stem and biased at a given voltage, so deterioration in radiation of the laser diode mounted on the substrate can be reduced, thereby stabilizing emission.

Akram also does not disclose this feature of the claims 1 and 8. Therefore, even combined, the cited references would not produce the present invention. This is strong evidence of non-obviousness.

Additionally, as noted on page 3 of the specification, the structure of Hasegawa creates a problem of insufficient integration of photodiodes. The structures recited in claims 1 and 8 allow for integration of photodiodes with the substrate.

Hasegawa, alone and in view of Akram, fails to disclose or suggest the invention as claimed. For the reasons stated above, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3 and 8-10.

For the foregoing reasons, applicants believe that this case is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The examiner should call applicants' attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By



Patrick G. Burns
Registration No. 29,367

September 3, 2004

300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312.360.0080
Facsimile: 312.360.9315

Customer No. 24978
P:\DOCS\3531\65362\AmdA.doc